DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 221 IR 051 068

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Link, Terry; And Others |
| TITLE | Michigan State University Library. A Final Report from the Public Services Research Projects. Non-Users of the MSU Libraries: An Assessment of Characteristics, Perceptions, and Needs at Michigan State University. One of a Series of Self-Studies and Research Projects. |
| INSTITUTION | Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.; Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Univ. Libraries. |
| SPONS AGENCY | General Electric Foundation, Ossining, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | Jan 85 |
| NOTE | 46p.; For related documents, see IR 051 066-074. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20036 ($15.00 per copy, prepaid). |
| PUB TYPE | Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Academic Libraries; *College Faculty; *College Students; Higher Education; Information Needs; Library Administration; Library Facilities; Library Materials; Library Planning; Library Research; *Library Services; Position Papers; Research Libraries; Self Evaluation (Groups); *User Satisfaction (Information); Use Studies |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Michigan State University |

ABSTRACT

This self-study--part of a series of studies conducted at Michigan State University Libraries--was designed to elicit information regarding non-use of the library by members of the academic community. A telephone survey questionnaire was administered to a stratified systematic sample of students and faculty members, and 1,269 students and 211 faculty members were interviewed. Frequent users among the students differed significantly from infrequent users in several ways: frequent users were more likely to be expected to write term papers and short papers, while infrequent users were more likely to report that library use was irrelevant to their coursework, there were too many demands on their time, the library was too complex, or its location was inconvenient. The chief difference between frequent and infrequent users among the faculty was the perception of need. Infrequent users were more likely to report they had no need to use the library. The importance of the library as an information source was rated very or extremely high by 97% of the faculty and 84% of the students. The questionnaires and their results are appended. (Author/THC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES**

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 232-8656

# PUBLIC SERVICES IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES

## FINAL REPORT FROM
## THE PUBLIC SERVICES RESEARCH PROJECTS

Michigan State University

Project sponsored by the General Electric Foundation

Office of Management Studies
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.
January, 1985

**OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES**

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 232-8656

## PUBLIC SERVICES IN RESEARCH LIBRARIES
## RESEARCH PROJECTS

Seven Association of Research Libraries (ARL) members conducted research on current public services concerns, as part of a Public Services in Research Libraries Project sponsored by the General Electric Foundation and operated by ARL's Office of Management Studies.

Research grants of up to $4,000 were provided for the projects, which were selected in part because of their potential usefulness to academic and research libraries. The subjects include the integration of online catalogs into public services, identification of the unique instructional and research needs of students and faculty in particular disciplines, and the impact of technology on both library users and staff members.

The Public Services in Research Libraries Project was financed by a $250,000 two-year grant from the General Electric Foundation. Now, the Office of Management Studies is offering academic libraries a series of aids to analyze, improve, and adapt their public services programs to changing economic, technological, and user needs. The aids include an assisted self-study process and training activities to benefit public services staff.

Additional copies of this report are available for $15.00 -- prepayment required -- from OMS, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Make check payable to "ARL Office of Management Studies." Outside the U.S. and Canada, add $5.00 postage and handling.

# NON-USERS OF THE MSU LIBRARIES: AN ASSESSMENT OF CHARACTERISTICS, PERCEPTIONS, AND NEEDS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Michigan State University Library

Terry Link
Kriss Ostrom
Agnes Haigh
Philip Marcus

Office of Management Studies
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D.C.
December 1984

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the contributions of numerous persons to this project. A special thanks is due Dr. Charles Ostrom, Associate Professor of Political Science, who helped forge the project design and who was a principal drafter of the proposal. We would also like to thank each of our library staff members who volunteered to interview faculty members. Beth Woodard, Cliff Haka, Anita Evans, Jane Arnold, Jeanette St. Clair, Dana Dinwiddie, Annie Pitts, Linda deWit and Denise Forro, made our workload lighter. In addition, we were fortunate to have the assistance of Anne Miller, whose only crime was being a willing spouse of a colleague, and who interviewed many faculty on our behalf. Arline Jennex has been the reliable magician of the word processor throughout this project and we are indebted to her for her patience and expeditiousness. Lynn Peltier of the MSU Office of Management and Budget and Jeanne Kropp of the Academic Personnel Records Office made our sampling procedure painless. Getting the data into the computer and getting it out again was greatly facilitated by Steven Green, a doctoral student in political science. Finally, we would like to thank the entire Technical Services Unit of the Library for allowing us to use their desks and phones to contact our students.

# NON-USERS OF THE MSU LIBRARIES: AN ASSESSMENT OF CHARACTERISTICS, PERCEPTIONS, AND NEEDS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Terry Link
Kriss Ostrom
Agnes Haigh
Philip Marcus

Abstract

A survey questionnaire was designed to elicit information regarding the non-use of an academic library by members of that academic community. The survey instruments were administered by telephone to a stratified systematic sample of students and faculty at Michigan State University. 1269 students and 211 faculty members were interviewed. Frequent users among the students differed significantly from infrequent users in several ways: frequent users were more likely to be expected to write term papers and short papers while infrequent users were more likely to report that library use was irrelevant to their coursework, there were too many demands on their time, the Library was too complex, and its location was inconvenient. The chief difference between frequent and infrequent library users among the faculty was the perception of need. Infrequent users were more likely to report they had no need to use the library. The importance of the library as an information source was rated very or extremely high by 97% of the faculty and 84% of the students.

## Introduction

We designed this telephone survey to gather information about both users and non-users of the Michigan State University (MSU) Library. The stratified sample consisted of a survey of 1269 students and 211 faculty randomly drawn in the spring quarter of 1984.

In a period of budget cuts, declining enrollment, and an information explosion, most academic libraries have difficulty maintaining their traditional level of service as a research and teaching facility. Some might ask why libraries would want to study the non-users when services are under stress. The very increase in workload trying to reach additional users might incur costs that could be better employed in sustaining or improving current services.

At Michigan State University Libraries we decided to study the non-users and try to develop programs to raise their participation because of our commitment to improving the dissemination of information through the library system. We think libraries are essential to a high quality education at the undergraduate, graduate and professional levels: students need to know what materials are available and how to use them. They need research documents for both practical and theoretical decisions. The non-user today is likely not to know what information is available for decision making, nor how to access available resources. In the long run, the library staff can help forestall some problems if we can locate the non-users, or low-users, and try to inte-

grate them into the flow of demands upon the library resources.

MSU is one of the largest single campuses in the United States serving approximately 40,000 students and 3,000 faculty. The library system includes a large central facility and 15 satellite branches, most of which specialize in the sciences. Many persons are startled when entering the Main Library for the first time, but freshmen, transfer students, and foreign students are particularly overwhelmed. Each fall nearly 10,000 new students have to deal with a library system of our size and complexity, and few have previous experience with a facility of this scale. Staff at the reference desk continually hear users say they just do not know where to begin. Even many graduating seniors report that they are using the library for the first time. "I have managed to go through four years without having to use this place," some brag. A recent study of library users here at MSU reported that ten percent of users leave the library when they cannot immediately find what they want. This same study revealed that in a sample of 71 patrons who reported to the Information Desk that the item they were seeking was not on the shelf, nearly half (47%) of those items were found immediately by library staff. This sample includes only those who report that they cannot find materials. The actual figures for all library users could easily be higher.

[Philip M. Marcus and Beth J. Shapiro, "How the MSU Community Uses Its Library," unpublished paper. Michigan State University Library, 22 April 1984.]

We also wanted to find out the characteristics of the non-users. Do they tend to be predominantly men or women? Older or younger? What information do they need and not obtain? What are the factors that discourage non-users and how many factors are actually under the control of the library administration? What are the non-users' perceptions of the role of the library in their profession or occupation? And where do they presently get their information?

These are some of the questions we wanted to answer in this research. We hoped that our study would prove useful to other large academic libraries in meeting their responsibilities to their communities. To do so we needed a set of questions that would represent the general problems that libraries face, and not merely those specifically related to MSU. Our review of the literature turned up only a few studies of non-users of academic libraries. John Lubans' two studies, one at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute in 1970 and the other at the University of Colorado in 1971-72, and Nurieh Musavi's study in 1975 at Carlow College in Pittsburgh were on a much smaller scale than the one we planned. Each study used different definitions of the non-users. Lubans' 1970 study found that library use was strictly course-related and that student use seemed most related to the amount of time they felt they had. At the University of Colorado, Lubans found little difference in the opinions of users and non-users. Musavi found that, compared to non-users, users (1) were more aware of resources and services; (2) had better library skills; and (3) had a more positive attitude toward libraries. In addition, she concluded that "library non-users may have been part of a large college facility non-use syndrome," that is, non-users of libraries tend to be non-users of other campus resources as well.

[Lubans, John, Jr., "Nonuse of an Academic Library," College and Research Libraries, September 1971, pp. 362-367; Lubans, John, Jr., "Library-use Instruction Needs from the Library Users'/Non-

users' Point of View: A Survey Report," in Lubans, John, Jr., Educating the Library User, New York, R. R. Bowker, 1974, pp. 401-409; Musavi, Nurieh, "Users and Non-users of College Libraries" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1977).]

Methods

Rather than use any predetermined definition of a non-user, we decided to draw a random sample of students and faculty and ask how often they used the library. We also realized that many users might go to branch libraries and not the main one, and some others might call on the phone for information and meet their needs without ever stepping foot in any of the facilities. Many bibliographic references, for example, are available over the phone. Faculty can phone for books and borrow them through campus mail, and then return them the same way. Many faculty can make up their entire assignments for required reading over the phone and through the use of campus mail. A number of faculty use assistants to get material from the library.

Because of limited resources, we decided not to use personal interviews. We also assumed that non-users might be more passive or disinterested in university or academic affairs, and would have a very low rate of return on a mail questionnaire. We chose a telephone interview and planned to reach 1500 students and 250 faculty members. (The faculty sample was approximately 10 percent of the total number employed at that time.)

A systematic stratified sample was decided upon. The student sample was stratified by college of enrollment and class rank (freshman, sophomore, etc.). We originally drew a sample of 1700 names using university records. After the initial two weeks of telephoning it was determined that an additional sample was needed to reach the goal of 1500 respondents. A supplemental sample of 496 names was drawn using the same methods as before. A table detailing the student samples response rates is appended. Analyses of the two samples showed no differences on responses to questions.

| ORIGINAL STUDENT SAMPLE | |
|---|---|
| Total number of names drawn | 1700 |
| Number without phone listings | 153 |
| Number moved or phone disconnected | 149 |
| Number declining to be interviewed | 42 |
| Number otherwise unreached | 234 |
| Number of completed interviews | 1122 |

| SUPPLEMENTAL STUDENT SAMPLE | |
|---|---|
| Total number of names drawn | 496 |
| Number of names duplicated in original sample | 17 |
| Number without phone listing | 58 |
| Number moved or phone disconnected | 35 |
| Number declining to be interviewed | 12 |
| Number otherwise unreached | 227 |
| Number completed interviews | 147 |

TOTAL STUDENT SAMPLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Total number of names drawn | 2196 | |
| Number of names duplicated | 17 | .8% |
| Number of names without phone listing | 211 | 9.6% |
| Number moved or phone disconnected | 184 | 8.4% |
| Number declining to be interviewed | 54 | 2.5% |
| Number otherwise unreached | 461 | 21.0% |
| Number completed interviews | 1269 | 57.8% |

The faculty sample consisted of approximately a 10 percent sample, and was stratified along college, rank, and tenure status based on current employment records. A table showing the faculty sample response rates follows.

FACULTY SAMPLE RESPONSE RATE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Number of names drawn | 405 | |
| Number declining to be interviewed | 9 | 2.2% |
| Number out of the country | 17 | 4.2% |
| Number who left the university | 8 | 2.0% |
| Number otherwise unreached | 160 | 39.5% |
| Number of completed interviews | 211 | 52.1% |

The final student questionnaire consisted of 18 basic questions with many subparts. Additional data--college of enrollment, rank, sex, and residency (on-campus versus off-campus)--were taken from university records as the sample was drawn. Interviewers were hired and trained, using many underemployed student library employees for this special task. Training consisted of a one-hour session plus two practice telephone interviews for each interviewer.

The student survey was administered during the first three weeks of classes in the 1984 spring term. Telephones in our technical services department were used during evening hours (5:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m., Sunday through Thursday) to contact the sampled students. Data from interviews were recorded on machine-readable scoring sheets by the interviewers. A grid, designed by the MSU computer center, was used to facilitate coding and help lower the error rate. Interviews lasted about 12 to 15 minutes each.

The final faculty questionnaire paralleled the student questionnaire but some questions were added about new and additional resources the library should purchase and about faculty expectations of students' use of the libraries. The final faculty questionnaire consisted of 24 questions with a number of subparts. Both the student and faculty instruments were pretested and modified. Additional data on the faculty, such as sex, length of time at the university, college, and rank were also gathered during the sampling process.

## Findings

In our preliminary analysis of both the students and the faculty we found some differences within each group and these should be noted at the outset. However, many of the differences merely reflect the different tasks that are required of faculty and students, or even within the student groups. In this section, then we will try to pinpoint some of these differences so that administrators can begin to think of distinctive programs for each group, and also focus upon some of the similarities for all persons when these seem

appropriate. Visiting the library seems to have almost the same frequency for both the students and the faculty: 21 percent of the students go a couple of times a term or never, and 24 percent of the faculty report the same use. But the two groups differ when we look at the frequency of phoning the library: 86 percent of the students report phoning a couple of times per term or never and 75 percent of the faculty are in these two categories. The big difference between the two is found among the persons who never call: 50 percent of the students but only 28 percent of the faculty do not use the phone services.

Certain services require visits to the library and cannot be handled over the phone. Photocopying of noncirculating materials or reading journals and recent magazines are examples. Then, too, some students use the library to meet others or hold special study sessions, and some come merely to be away from crowded apartments and dormitory rooms. The faculty may come to keep up on the latest materials or those available only on microfiche or in special collections. Reasons for coming to the library may differ even though the actual proportion of students and faculty actually entering the building is approximately the same.

We decided to collapse the two lowest categories on our five-point scale because of possible biases in the answers. We included "a couple of times per term" and "never" because some persons may have forgotten when they went to the library or used a service, while others may be somewhat ashamed to admit not going. The data we collected support this assumption. When asked how important libraries were, 86 percent of the students and 97 percent of the faculty claimed it was very or extremely important (see page 7). Therefore, we thought the two categories should be combined into one that we could designate as a low user group. Later in this report we shall have some other combinations that seem appropriate when discussing the faculty and students separately in the analysis, but here we shall treat the two groups in a similar fashion.

Table 1 shows the results for both faculty and students in our analysis of the different uses people make of the library. We see that 45 percent of the students and 30 percent of the faculty report infrequent asking for help. This may reflect more sophistication of the faculty, or it may reflect the inability of students to use the services when they are offered. The same pattern is seen when we asked respondents about uses at different locations: students are less likely to seek help than faculty. The Reference Desk attracted the most use by both groups with only 32 percent of the students and 23 percent of the faculty noting they did not seek assistance there. The Information Desk was second most used for help, and only four out of ten students had not asked for help here, while one out of three faculty did not use it. In answers to all the other questions we asked about seeking help in the library, we found over 50 percent of both faculty and students in the non-user category. Although we would hardly expect to find a large proportion of faculty using the Assigned Reading desk for help, it did surprise us that 57 percent of the students did not seek assistance at this place. Three-quarters of the students seldom sought help at the Circulation Desk. When we asked about other places in the library that users might seek help, we found 80 percent of the students and 73 percent of the faculty failed to mention another place. This suggested to us that our survey did top the most frequently used places and if some places were not mentioned, it was not an oversight. We knew that some persons may go to other libraries and we asked if they sought help there among the special collections, e.g., in science,

mathematics or music. About one-half of the respondents reported they never availed themselves of help in these other libraries, with 54 percent of the students and 51 percent of the faculty falling into our non-user category.

Respondents who reported asking for help at any of the above places or who reported phoning were given a five point scale on which they could rate the quality of the staff giving information and assistance. Table 2 shows the results of this set of questions for the different places in the library. We combined the top two of the five-point scale, and we see that the Information and Reference Desks receive the top grades and that these are the places that are used the most. About four out of five students give high marks to the staff at the two desks. The faculty, who are less likely to ask for help, are also less likely to rate the staff as high, but we still see 73 percent giving high marks to staff at the Reference Desk and 61 percent giving the same high rating for help received at the Information Desk. The discrepancy between the two groups is large at the Circulation and the Checkout Desks, 12 percent and 31 percent respectively. At other points in the library and at other libraries on campus, the differences in perceptions of the students and faculty are even greater, 64 percent and 35 percent. Clearly, the two groups do not rate

TABLE 1
Proportion of Low and Non-Users of Library

| How often respondents: | Students % | Faculty % |
|---|---|---|
| Rarely or never: | | |
| Phone | 86 | 75 |
| Go | 21 | 24 |
| Ask help | 45 | 30 |
| Never ask for help at: | | |
| Reference Desk | 32 | 23 |
| Information Desk | 41 | 32 |
| Checkout | 74 | 54 |
| Assigned Reading | 57 | 58 |
| Circulation Desk | 75 | 58 |
| Other places in library | 80 | 73 |
| Other libraries | 54 | 51 |

the helpfulness of the staff in a similar way; and the students are always on the high side except for the help received on the phone, with only 36 percent of the students rating the help high and 92 percent of the faculty rating the assistance high.

TABLE 2
User Ratings of High Helpfulness at Different Points in the Library

| Where Help Offered: | Students % | Faculty % |
|---|---|---|
| Phone | 36 | 92 |
| Information Desk | 81 | 61 |
| Reference Desk | 79 | 73 |
| Checkout | 50 | 39 |
| Assigned Reading | 72 | 31 |
| Circulation | 69 | 38 |
| Other places in Main Library | 87 | 23 |
| Other Libraries | 76 | 41 |

The perceptions of the users may differ because of the places they seek assistance, the kinds of assistance they need, and the status of the recipient. We know that the more highly qualified persons work at the Reference Desks and and this may explain their high ratings. Then, too, students may be more satisfied with the helpfulness because they ask simpler questions and can more easily be served than faculty. The faculty are quite satisfied with the help they receive on the phone and perhaps this reflects the kind of information they seek, such as bibliographic references or call numbers for assigned reading lists, or whether or not a book is in the library and available for circulation. Faculty may reserve the hardest and most complicated questions for library staff when they actually visit the building. Many are quite happy to look for their materials and are familiar with the different collections and services. Only when these resources do not satisfy their needs do faculty request help. Indeed, many may find it slightly insulting to think they need help in searching for resources, and may be reluctant to ask for help. In part this may be due to the generally higher education of the faculty who may not like to admit their dependency on the library staff who have fewer years of education. Or it may be due to the disproportionately large group of male faculty members and the fairly small proportion of male librarians. For highly educated male faculty, fear of exposing their ignorance may interfere with their receiving high quality information, or they might slightly depreciate it when it is offered.

Respondents were asked what uses they made of the library. The two lists could not be the same and Table 3 shows the answers for each group. In Table 3a we see that students use the library primarily to study, use noncirculating materials, and to use photcopying machines. Over three-quarters of the student respondents made these uses of the library. About two-thirds of the group checked out materials, used assigned readings, or looked for other types of information. About one-third had a computer search done, or read current magazines, and less than one-fifth used typewriters. Audio and visual materials and instruction in library use were reported by approximately two-fifths of the students. We think the student response to use computer searches overestimates their use of the service. In all likelihood, students are including use of CLSI and OCLC systems in their answers.

The faculty reported they used the library to check out materials (84%), obtain reference assistance (79%), read current journals (76%), read other non-circulating materials (70%), and make photcopies (73%). (See Table 3b.) Only 23% said they worked in a carrel and about one-fifth reported arranging instruction for students. Interlibrary loan was used by 61% of the faculty, about the same proportion who put materials on reserve, made suggestions for purchasing materials, or simply browsed. Half of the faculty respondents had used the library for a computer search.

Both faculty and students agree that, irrespective of how much they use the library, and for whatever purposes, the library is very important as a source of information in their professional fields. When asked on a five-point scale how important the library was to their respective professions, 86 percent of the students responded at the top two points of the five-point scale and 97 percent of the faculty had a similar reaction. Clearly, then, there is great agreement about the importance of the library as a source of support for their work. For another point of view on the same issue, we asked about faculty expectations for using the library and tried to assess whether the inclusion of library use was part of the learning experience. One hundred

percent of the students said that faculty expected them to use the library and 75 percent of the faculty said they expected students to use it. This finding does not imply that students and faculty do not agree about expectations to use the library. We must remember that the students were randomly sampled, as were the faculty, and the two groups were not matched. The actual question asked of students permitted them to answer for any of the faculty with whom they took a course and not necessarily the ones in our sample. Similarly, the faculty may have required students to use the library in one of their courses but not in another.

TABLE 3
Uses Made of the Library by Students and Faculty

| 3a–Students | | 3b–Faculty | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Studying | 75% | Checking out materials | 84% |
| Non-circulating materials | 87 | Reading current materials | 76 |
| Checking out materials | 67 | Reading noncirculating | 70 |
| Reading current magazines | 67 | Making photocopies | 73 |
| Using typewriters | 33 | Suggesting new purchases | 58 |
| Using copying machines | 80 | Computer search | 51 |
| Using assigned reading | 66 | Putting material on reserve | 60 |
| Having computer search done | 30 | Obtain reference assistance | 79 |
| Finding other information | 70 | Request interlibrary loan | 61 |
| Using audio or visual material | 42 | Browse | 58 |
| Getting instruction | 39 | Work in carrel | 23 |
| | | Arrange library help | 21 |

What Discourages Users?

But we know that verbal affirmation of the library's importance does not necessarily coincide with actual use of the library and the different services available. Some people may not go to the library, many do not phone, others do not ask for assistance with difficult problems, and we wanted to pinpoint some of the most important reasons for low usage. Specifically, we wanted to know what discourages a person from using any of the campus libraries. This question was deliberately vague and permitted respondents to answer in terms of any of the different libraries. Also, the question does not specify whether or not we are referring to phoning, visiting, or some of the more specific activities in the buildings themselves. For example, a person might go to the library and use all the services but still feel that the crowdedness was discouraging and a feature that had to be tolerated. We asked about the negatives (discouraging features) rather than merely what people do not like because we were trying to locate factors that lowered the willingness to use the library. We asked the respondents to tell which of 12 different discouragements might affect their behavior. Table 4 shows the proportion of students and faculty responding "yes" to each item.

These questions can be analyzed in a number of different ways. We started by looking at the differences between the faculty and students' answers. We see that crowdedness ranks the highest for the students, but only seventh for the faculty (55 percent of the students and 16 percent of the faculty report this discourages them from using the library.) Parking ranks second for both groups, about 40 percent reporting this discourages them from using the library. (We have to assume that "parking" means the absence of spaces and not their availability.) Noise ranks third for the students (38 percent)

but only eighth for the faculty (13 percent). The first-ranked item for the faculty is that there are too many demands on their time (65 percent of the faculty reported this discouraged them); this item ranked only fourth for the students (36 percent). The lowest-ranked items were about the same for faculty and students: the library staff, the concern about security, and the library rules and policies all drew under 15 percent of the "yes" responses.

TABLE 4
Discouragements to Using the Library

| | Students | Faculty |
|---|---|---|
| Location | 21% | 26% |
| Crowdedness | 55 | 16 |
| Concern with security | 10 | 5 |
| Noise | 38 | 13 |
| Library staff | 4 | 4 |
| Not enough library material | 11 | 38 |
| Complexity | 32 | 24 |
| Too many demands on time | 36 | 65 |
| Parking | 40 | 41 |
| Missing materials | 28 | 40 |
| Lack of carrels | 27 | 9 |
| Library rules and policies | 14 | 10 |

If we take the mean of the percentage of students reporting discouragements, we have an average of 26.3; for the faculty the mean is 24.2, and the difference between these two scores is trivial. Only one item scores above 50 percent for the students, crowdedness, and only one has that high a score for the faculty, too many demands on time. Now the difference between these two items is that library staff have no control over the demands on the faculty, but they might be able to do something about the crowdedness. Only one item scores as high as 40 percent among the students, parking, while two items score that high for the faculty, parking and missing materials. We should note that noise and crowdedness bother the students very much more than the faculty are troubled, 38 vs 13, and 55 vs 16. Perhaps faculty are not in the library to study the materials as much and these two features might not bother them; or perhaps the faculty are more likely to use special documents and collections where few people gather or to use their own carrels. Faculty may be more likely to take out books and materials rather than use them in the library, or they may avoid the most crowded times during evenings and the last two weeks of a term. Students often have to go to the library toward the end of the term and cannot avoid the crowds, while faculty have more discretion over their time. Faculty are probably more likely to use the library during the day while many students are in class, and students are more likely to use the library at night. All of these speculations might explain some of these findings, but we could not check them as explanations with our data; we will have to wait for another study to test these ideas.

The percentages for each item can be ranked and a Spearman rank order correlation coefficient computed. We found a relationship that almost reached the accepted level for statistical significance ($p<.05$); the correlation coefficient was $r_s=.49$, $p<.06$. This finding, in addition to the discussion above, suggests that the faculty and students have different views on the library and that programs to help one group will not necesarily help another. Indeed, one important finding from this study is the isolation of factors over which library staff have little control. No new policy can raise faculty

usage if the outside demands far exceed their allotted time for library related research. How many academic libraries control the parking situation?

## Use of Other Libraries

We asked our respondents about some of the other libraries they used. Some of these libraries are on the MSU campus, some are public or college libraries in the metropolitan Lansing area, and still others are within an hour's drive. We wondered if those who heavily used the MSU main libraries also used many others, or, possibly, whether low users found other libraries more attractive and with fewer distractions. In general, we did not find heavy use of other libraries. The University of Michigan library, a major national resource about one-hour's driving time from Michigan State University, was used only by 24 percent of the faculty, and 4 percent of the students. The State of Michigan library, another major resource located in the Lansing area, was used only by 20 percent of the faculty and 3 percent of the students. Some of the public libraries, such as the Lansing Public Library and the East Lansing Public Library, were also used by just a small proportion of our respondents: 11 percent of faculty use the Lansing Public Library and only 7 percent of the students did so; 37 percent of faculty use the East Lansing Public Library, and 11 percent of the students did so. Less than 20 percent of the respondents said they used other public libraries, and 10 percent reported using other college libraries. Clearly, it is not the major discouragements of the MSU library that forces people to go to other places.

## Frequent and Infrequent Users - Introduction

One purpose of this study was to find out some of the differences between the high and low users of library services and facilities. The two questions we used to measure were on the frequency of phoning and the frequency of visiting. Both of these questions will be used in our analysis for both students and faculty. To preserve the narrative flow, we will discuss the most important findings without elaborate statistical tables. The interested reader will find a complete set of frequencies in the Appendices A and B and other supporting tables are available from the authors upon request. In this section we will focus upon the student use of the library, and in the next part examine the faculty.

One of our most interesting findings was the significant but low association between the two important measures of library use. Although the finding would occur by chance less than three in a hundred times, $p<.03$, in the faculty sample, and less than one in a thousand for the student group, $P<.001$, we also found it would be almost pointless to try and predict the frequency of visiting the library from the frequency of phone calls. The measure of association, Kendall's tau c was but +.13 in the student sample, and +.15 in the faculty sample. This low association suggested to us that the two measures were not on the same dimension and should be treated separately because respondents do see the two types of uses in very distinctive ways. Table 5 shows the distributions for these two variables in the two samples. The most obvious point to mention is the high degree of similarity between faculty and students in the way they use the two library services.

TABLE 5
FREQUENCY OF STUDENT AND FACULTY* VISITING AND PHONING THE LIBRARY
*faculty percentages are in parentheses

| Phone: | Never or couple of times a week (few)% | Every few weeks (some)% | Once a week (many)% | More than once a week (very many)% | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Never (few) | 30 | 18 | 19 | 34 | 100 |
| | (35) | (18) | (15) | (32) | (100) |
| Couple of times a week (some) | 16 | 20 | 25 | 39 | 100 |
| | (24) | (24) | (27) | (24) | (100) |
| Every few weeks or more often (many) | 7 | 21 | 29 | 43 | 100 |
| | (11) | (23) | (25) | (41) | (100) |

VISIT

Students: N = 1267 $p<.001$ tau c = .13
Faculty: N = 211 $p<.03$ tau c = .15

Frequent and Infrequent Users - Students

Students who frequently phone the library report that staff are very helpful with their requests. It is also true that students who visit the library often find the staff helpful when they make calls. Both of these two types of users report they make frequent requests when they are in the libraries. The perceptions of staff helpfulness among the two groups does not carry over into all parts of the staff and services, however. Table 6 summarizes the findings on the two types of users and how they perceive helpfulness from the staff in different parts of the library.

TABLE 6
Summary of Student Users' Perceptions of Helpfulness

| Source of help | Phone Users | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Reference desk | .94* | .02* |
| Information desk | .13 | .07 |
| Check-out desk | .65 | .17 |
| Assigned reading | .80 | .20 |
| Circulation desk | .99 | .35 |
| Shelvers | .43 | .02 |
| Other places in library | .81 | .14 |
| Other libraries | .89 | .65 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

In Table 6 we see that high and low frequency phone callers do not differ in their perceptions of helpfulness in the library. Not one of the possible sources of help falls into the accepted range of a statistically significant finding, that is, the probability that the relationship is not random falls below ($p<.05$). However, when we look at the visitors to the library, those who actually come into the building, we find a much different pattern. Those students who come often to the library are more likely to find the staff

helpful at the Reference Desk and among the shelvers ($p<.05$). We also see that the differences between the high and low visitors almost reaches the significance level for the Information Desk, ($p<.07$) and we should look upon this finding as consistent with the other two. In sum, students who come frequently to the library report they find staff extremely helpful at the reference and information desks and among the shelvers. In our judgment, of the possible sources of help, these are among the most important in the library, and the Reference Desk has some of the most highly trained personnel available to users. The Information Desk is used often, especially by undergraduates who can get help locating books and finding special collections. It should also be noted that both desks are located near entrances to the Library. The shelvers can save users much time because they know where the different call number are located on the floors and they know about the materials in transition, such as those that have been returned but are not yet back in their normal place, or those that are being relocated. This occurrence is most likely to happen when the materials are in high demand and at busy times when the flow of books and journals temporarily rises beyond the capacity of the staff to handle them. Well-trained shelvers also know how to use computer terminals that can save users trips to the main floor and searching the card catalogues.

Table 7 shows that high users differ from low users in the demands they place upon the library. For example, among the phone users, we see no difference between the high and low callers in terms of their using the library for studying, for computer searches, for audio and visual equipment, and for receiving instruction in library usage ($p<.05$). We should note that the differences between the high and low users does almost approach the statistically significant levels for the use of audio and visual equipment ($p<.09$ and $p<.08$ respectively). But in all the other uses of the library, high phone callers report a higher use of services and facilities than the low users reported.

TABLE 7

Uses of the Library for Phone Callers and Visitors

| Uses of the Library | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Study | .43* | .00* |
| Use non-circulating materials | .00 | .01 |
| Check out materials | .00 | .00 |
| Read current magazines and journals | .00 | .00 |
| Use typewriters | .01 | .00 |
| Use copy machines | .00 | .00 |
| Use assigned reading | .00 | .00 |
| Do a computer search | .20 | .00 |
| Finding information | .00 | .00 |
| Using audio and visual equipment | .09 | .00 |
| Getting instruction in library use | .08 | .04 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

The difference between high and low visitors to the library is even more marked than among the phone callers. Here we see that high users report a higher use of all library services and facilities we listed in our interviews. This finding presents an interesting dilemma for the library if we extrapolate the findings and ask what would happen if we increased the frequency of visitors' use of resources in the library. Might we find some services and facilities overwhelmed with requests for a raise in the budgets becoming almost impossible to meet?

How important is the library to the careers of the students? Both the high phone users and the high frequency visitors give more importance to the library than the low users of either type. And yet we find that the high and low users do not differ in their perceptions that the faculty give instruction or advice about using the library. In short, students must acquire the knowledge to use the libraries on their own but some of them know of its potential contribution to their careers. One interesting question that arises, and which we cannot answer with our data, is whether or not the students know of the library's importance to their careers and then are drawn to use it, or whether the use gets reinforced as they begin to realize what it can contribute.

Students told the interviewers what they thought the faculty expected of them. Table 8 shows those expectations that distinguished among the high and low users of the library. Much to our surpise, we did not find as many as we expected, and we did not find agreement between the two types of users. For example, although both high telephone users and frequent visitors said they were expected to use the assigned readings, the more frequent visitors also said they were expected to write term papers. The expectation of writing term papers, however, did not differentiate the high from the low phone callers. We see a similar pattern between the two types of users and their reported expectations of writing short papers. This is not surprising since one would expect that term papers, of all the possible assignments mentioned, require the use of the Library.

TABLE 8

Faculty Expectations of Students - 1

| Expectation | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Use assigned reading in library | .01* | .01* |
| Write term paper | .51 | .01 |
| Write book review | .43 | .37 |
| Find and read magazines and journals | .01 | .00 |
| Prepare an oral report | .52 | .12 |
| Write a short paper | .11 | .00 |
| Listen to or review tapes | .33 | .33 |
| Complete a library workbook | .35 | .32 |
| Write a lab report | .04 | .01 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

The two types of users, and their frequency of use, were not differentiated in their reports of faculty expectations to prepare oral reports, listen to or review tapes, write book reviews, or even to complete a library workbook. Table 8 also shows that high phone callers and high visitors were more likely to say the faculty expected the writing of lab reports and the finding and reading of journals and magazines.

TABLE 9

Faculty Expectations of Students - 2

| Faculty Expectation | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Learn or memorize facts | .47* | .12* |
| Interpret facts | .06 | .02 |
| Criticize written materials | .01 | .96 |
| Synthesize different facts or points of view | .01 | .19 |
| Solve problems | .07 | .03 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

In addition to the expectations faculty might have of students in meeting course requirements, faculty also approach knowledge in different ways. We asked a series of questions about these approaches to learning and what student orientations might be needed. Table 9 shows the results. First of all, we see no difference between the high or low users among the frequent phone callers or the visitors when it comes to an expectation of learning or memorizing facts. But when it comes to interpreting facts, the high frequency visitors are clearly more likely to see this as a faculty expectation than are low frequency users. The difference between the high and low frequency phone callers is almost significant ($p<.06$) and we think this should be seen as a distinctive mark among the students who call. We see the same pattern in the student reports of faculty expectations for the students to solve problems: a clear distinction between the high and the low visitors, and a very near distinction among the high and low phone callers ($p<.07$). In both cases, the high users are more likely than the low users to see interpreting facts and solving problems as faculty expectations. Once again we do not know if the students are reporting these expectations before they start going to the library frequently, or whether they learn how to use more library information in their classroom work and the faculty reward them with higher grades.

Table 9 also shows that high frequency phone callers differ from low frequency phone callers in some ways that the visitors do not. For example, we see that high frequency phone callers report that faculty expect them to criticize written materials and to synthesize different points of view; no such distinctions exist among the high and low frequency visitors.

We now turn to a set of questions asking respondents to indicate what discourages them from using the library. These items all referred to coming to the library and none could be interpreted as inhibiting a phone call. But we often wondered if some people prefer to call the library because they do not want to make a trip, and if so, what is it about the library that makes the call preferable? Table 10 shows the results for the two types of users.

First of all we should note that only two of the 14 discouragements we asked respondents to consider actually discriminated among the high and low frequency telephone callers, namely parking and missing materials. The parking complaint among the frequent callers made good sense because it implied they wanted to save time and get information over the phone and resented the crowded conditions. Also, they may not have wanted to waste time looking for possibly missing materials and reported this as one reason why they would find going to the library discouraging. Indeed, the same problem with missing materials was also cited among the frequent visitors to the library. However, the frequent visitors to the library did not mention parking as a discouragement any more often than did other visitors ($p>.03$).

TABLE 10

Discouragements to Using the Library

| Discouragement | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Location | .50* | .04* |
| Piped-in music | .26 | .04 |
| Crowdedness | .51 | .52 |
| Security | .60 | .08 |
| Noise | .85 | .01 |
| Library staff | .27 | .55 |
| Not enough library materials | .34 | .34 |
| Complexity | .10 | .00 |
| Too many demands on own time | .46 | .00 |
| Parking | .01 | .12 |
| Irrelevant to coursework | .38 | .00 |
| Missing materials | .02 | .00 |
| Seating | .38 | .20 |
| Library rules and policies | .17 | .00 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

Table 11 shows that frequent visitors to the library do see the services and facilities very differently from those who seldom come. Eight of the 14 items differentiate the frequent from the infrequent visitors, and one other item, security, approaches staistical significance ($p<.08$). On some of the items frequent visitors seem more critical of library services and facilities, while on other discouragements the less frequent visitors appeared more bothered. In short, we did not find that discouragements necessarily turned people away from the library with the possible exception of complexity, but they may only reflect a greater realization of the need for ideal circumstances under which to work. For example, we included a bogus item in the list, piped-in music, and we see that frequent visitors are more likely to complain about it. This reflects, we think, the frequent users' setting up a work environment without distractions and sometimes not noticing if the distractions actually exist. The frequent visitor was also more likley to complain about noise in the library, missing materials, and library rules and regulations. Other significant differences appeared with the low users reporting the factors as discouragements. For example, we found low frequency visitors were more likely to report the library was irrelevant to their coursework, they had too many demands on their time (substantiation of Lubans' claims), the Library was too complex, and the location was inconvenient. Table 11 summarizes the differences between the high and low frequency visitors and what they found discouraging when using the library.

TABLE 11

Discouragements to Visitors Using the Library

| Discouragement | Low Frequency Visitors | High Frequency Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Location | 26% | 17%* |
| Piped-in music | 10 | 17* |
| Crowdedness | 52 | 55 |
| Security | 7 | 10 |
| Noise | 36 | 43* |
| Library staff | 6 | 3 |
| Not enough library materials | 8 | 12 |
| Complexity | 39 | 24* |
| Too many demands on own time | 48 | 29* |
| Parking | 50 | 43 |
| Irrelevant to coursework | 29 | 13* |
| Missing materials | 19 | 34* |
| Seating | 23 | 30 |
| Library rules and policies | 9 | 20* |

*Statistically significant difference, $p<.05$.

What else can we tell about the two types of student users and the frequency with which each takes advantage of library services and faciltiies? We only asked a few demographic questions and these showed little differentiation among the telephone users, but they did differentiate among the visitors. Table 12 summarizes the differences for us. We see that as the students rose in academic standing, the more they used the library. Specifically, we found a big jump after the freshman year, and then small increments afterwards. Among the visitors, high users came from the higher academic classes, they planned to attend graduate school, they were more likely to be males and they were more likely to live off campus. The latter was truly a surprise as we had assumed that proximity would make it easier to get to the library and use it.

TABLE 12

Demographic Characteristics of Phone Callers and Visitors

| Demographic Characteristic | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Year in School (Class) | .03* | .00* |
| Plan to attend graduate school | .25 | .01 |
| Gender | .20 | .03 |
| Live on or off campus | .25 | .06 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

## Frequent and Infrequent Users - Faculty

Now that we have examined the findings for the student sample, we turn our attention to the faculty. As we saw earlier, the faculty answers to questions about using the phones and visiting did not have the same distributions as those for the students, but the overall patterns were significantly related and the measures of association were almost the same, around .15. (See Table 5.) In this section we shall analyze the data just as we did for the students, looking first at the degree of helpfulness, then at the uses of the library, followed by expectations for students and then the discouragements that faculty see.

Table 13 shows us that significant differences appear in the perceptions of helpfulness between high and low frequency phone callers, and between frequent and infrequent visitors to the library. Both the high users of

phones and the frequent visitors see the helpfulness at the Information and Reference Desks as very high. Then too, the frequent phone callers see the help of the Bibliographers as very high. The frequent visitors see help at the other libraries as very high. Both the high callers and visitors have almost statistically significant differences from their low frequency counterparts in the perceptions of help at the Circulation Desk ($p<.07$ and $p<.08$ respectively). But no differences between the high and low users appear in the perceptions of helpfulness at the check-out desks, the assigned reading room, and other places in the library. If the two most important sources of information are the Information and Reference Desks, then clearly the faculty who use the library frequently are getting the needed assistance.

TABLE 13

Summary of Faculty Users' Perceptions of Helpfulness

| Source of help | Phone Users | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Reference desk | .02* | .01* |
| Information desk | .01 | .00 |
| Check-out desk | .30 | .18 |
| Assigned reading | .29 | .22 |
| Circulation desk | .07 | .08 |
| Bibliographers | .01 | .27 |
| Other places in library | .59 | .87 |
| Other libraries | .30 | .00 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

Some interesting questions arise, however. First of all, do the frequent users get the assistance because they are more likely to ask questions? Some faculty may visit or phone because they have more questions to ask, or because they have come to expect more help. Other faculty may have had better experiences and the reinforcement with answers from the library staff encourages the return and additional questions. Then, too, asking many questions may teach some faculty how to ask questions that can be answered by the library staff. Infrequent calls or visits may lead to the poor phrasing of questions, or to the requests for information that are not available from the staff. We do not have answers for these questions but other researchers might attend to some of the reasons that may underlie our findings.

When faculty were asked what uses they made of the library, we found some interesting answers. In Table 14 we see that frequent callers and visitors were more likely to use the library for checking out materials, but the callers and the visitors differed on other uses. For example, while the frequent callers used non-circulating materials more than infrequent callers, high frequency visitors did not differ from their counterparts on this use. But when it came to reading current magazines and journals, we found the opposite: no difference between the two types of callers, but significant differences between the high and low frequency visitors. Frequent callers, compared to infrequent callers, were also more likely to use the library to put materials on reserve, arrange for library instruction for their students, and get reference assistance. The frequent visitors, on the other hand, reported more browsing then the infrequent visitors. Neither group of users showed a relationship between the frequency of use and the requests for interlibrary loans or the use of copy machines, although among the frequent visitors we did find that the high users had an almost significant difference from the low users ($p<.08$).

TABLE 14

Uses of the Library for Phone Callers and Visitors

| Uses of the Library | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Use of non-circulating materials | .05* | .11* |
| Check-out materials | .00 | .04 |
| Read current magazines and journals | .54 | .00 |
| Requesting an interlibrary loan | .25 | .21 |
| Use copy machines | .46 | .08 |
| Materials for purchasing | .17 | .58 |
| Do a computer search | .29 | .46 |
| Getting reference assistance | .00 | .54 |
| Putting materials on reserve | .01 | .18 |
| Browsing | .94 | .00 |
| Using a carrel | .65 | .38 |
| Arranging library instruction for students | .03 | .80 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

We asked faculty about their expectations of students and found that high users and low users did not differ among the phone callers or the visitors. Table 15 shows that only three items in the phone caller group, and none in the visitor group, even came close to differentiating the frequent and infrequent users. The slight tendencies we noted were that frequent callers more often reported they expected students to use assigned reading and to write short papers and term papers ($p<.06$, $p<.06$ and $p<.07$ respectively). We did find, however, that faculty who reported high frequency of phone calling also reported they were more likely to tell students how to use the library ($p<.04$). No such difference between the high and low users was found among the visitors ($p<.13$).

TABLE 15

Faculty Expectations of Students

| Expectation | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Use assigned reading in library | .06* | .16* |
| Write term paper | .06 | .97 |
| Write book review | .35 | .36 |
| Find and read magazines and journals | .38 | .74 |
| Write a short paper | .07 | .89 |
| Write a lab report | .21 | .12 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

When faculty were asked what discouraged them from using the library, we found very few differences between the high and low users among the phone callers and the visitors. The reader will recall that frequent and infrequent student visitors differed significantly on eight of the 14 items we included in our survey. For the faculty visitors, however, we see no such pattern and the high and low frequency visitors differ only in terms of a general statement about "no need." (Crowdedness almost reaches the significance level ($p<.08$ and $P<.07$) for both the visitors and the callers and we should consider this complaint as a discouragement to the low users in both categories.) Among the phone callers, we do find a few significant differences between the frequent and the infrequent users. For example, faculty who called seldom were more likely to complain about crowdedness and complexity, but those who called frequently were more likely to complain about missing materials. (This is the exact opposite of the student group where the frequent callers were less likely to complain about missing materials. See Table 11.) Faculty who

seldom called were also more likely to say they had no need for the resources of the library.

Although we do not show the data, we do have some findings on what faculty think are important sources of information such as books they purchase, department libraries, journals, conferences and browsing in book stores. We wanted to know what are some of the alternatives, perhaps even competitors, for the library services, facilities, and resources. For both the callers and the visitors, we found no differences between the frequent and inrrequent users.

TABLE 16
Discouragements to Using the Library

| Discouragement | Phone Callers | Visitors |
|---|---|---|
| Location | .91* | .36* |
| Crowdedness | .07 | .08 |
| Security | .10 | .96 |
| Noise | .98 | .19 |
| Library staff | .74 | .61 |
| Not enough library materials | .99 | .18 |
| Complexity | .08 | .25 |
| Too many demands on own time | .89 | .29 |
| Parking | .91 | .98 |
| Missing materials | .01 | .22 |
| Lack of carrels | .68 | .36 |
| Library rules and policies | .72 | .70 |
| No need | .03 | .00 |

*Probability that difference between high and low users are random.

When faculty were asked about their use of other libraries, we found the frequent visitors were more likely to report they used the University of Michigan Library, but they did not differ from infrequent visitors when we asked about using other local libraries. Faculty who called the MSU library frequently reported they were more likely to use the Lansing Public Library. When the faculty were asked why they used the other libraries, frequent callers and visitors were likely to report it was because of the collection and resources, mostly for leisure reading material and books for their children. However, we found no other reason made a significant distinction between the high and low users even though we asked about services, location, environment, and the library staff.

When we looked at the differences between the high and low callers and visitors along demographic lines, we found no way to tell them apart. We had thought that high users would be older or have had more experience here at MSU, but such was not the case. Men did not differ from women in the frequency of phoning or visiting, nor did rank discriminate. In short, the traditional explanations for differences we might find among the faculty using the libraries elude us at this time. We do plan some additional analyses of these data, however, and will report them in other papers.

## Conclusions

This study has focused on the differences between frequent library users and infrequent or nonusers of the MSU Libraries. Few if any surprises have been revealed. Among the students we see that frequent visitors use all of the libraries' services and facilities more than infrequent visitors. Frequent visitors are more likely to report that faculty expect them to write term papers or short papers than are infrequent visitors. Frequent users (both callers and visitors) are more likely to report that faculty expect them to use assigned reading, read magazines and journals, or write lab reports, than are infrequent users. Frequent users are also more likely to report that faculty expect them to interpret facts and solve problems than are infrequent users. In addition, frequent users are more likely to be from higher academic classes, male, live off-campus, and plan to attend graduate school if they don't already.

Correspondingly, infrequent users among students are more likely to report that library use was irrelevant to their coursework and that they had too many demands on their time. These findings parallel Lubans' findings at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. In addition, our study also indicates that infrequent users are more likely to find the Library is too complex and its location is inconvenient.

The analysis of the faculty responses shows far fewer differences between frequent and infrequent library users. The chief difference appears to be that what discourages infrequent users of the libraries is simply that there is no perceived need and, to a lesser extent, the crowdedness. Regardless of how much they personally use the libraries, most faculty (97%) believe that libraries are extremely or very important as sources of information for themselves and their students. A full 75 percent of them expect their students to use libraries to complete their courses successfully. In addition, most faculty expect their students to know how to use the libraries by the time they enter their classes. This is attested to by the 74 percent of faculty who do not tell their students how to use libraries as well as the 76 percent of them who have never sought library instruction for their students. We also heard many comments from the faculty during the interviews, stating that they thought students should already know how to use libraries by the time they got to college.

Although we thought we might find that use was relative to awareness, we were not able to verify that assumption in this study. There simply was no verifiable relationship between awareness of services or resources and library use among either faculty or students. This finding is contrary to Musavi's reported results in her study at Carlow College. For students and faculty alike, use appears to be most directly related to perceived need. From the students' point of view, the faculty are the chief architects of this perceived need. However, there is some inkling that increased use fosters more positive feelings toward both the quality of the helpfulness of the library staff and the importance of libraries as information sources. We cannot pinpoint from our findings what creates the need for faculty, but that may be of interest to future researchers. We also know that beyond the perception of need, constraint of time is a chief determinant of library use for both students and faculty.

If we are to attempt to build programs that will draw current infrequent or nonusers to the services, resources and facilities of the libraries, we

must realize these chief constraints are outside of our control. It has been obvious to many of us involved in library instruction that the impact of instruction in library research is most effective when supported by and done in tangent with faculty members. Outreach to the non-interested student would be most effective if handled in the same manner. Once we are able to draw students in to use our libraries more, we must realize that the barriers of complexity and environment (parking and crowdedness at MSU) must be diminished if we hope to have our infrequent visitors return. Seeing that our entire community is aware of the valuable resources, services, and facilities that we can offer is part of our mission.

It is also imperative that we resolve the seeming conflict between faculty expectations of students and students' ability to use libraries effectively and efficiently. We did not look into the ability of users and nonusers to use libraries. If Musavi's findings are accurate then we might expect that the nonusers or infrequent users will be less effective users of the libraries. Since it is apparent that most faculty believe students should be capable of using a major research library we must work out methods of bridging this apparent gap in expectation and reality. Becoming aware of what users and nonusers, students and faculty, think about libraries and information is a step in the right direction.

## APPENDIX A

### NON-USERS STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

(Figures represent % of respondents answering.)

My name is _____ and I'm calling from the MSU Libraries. We have received a grant from the Association of Research Libraries, supported by the General Electric Foundation, to see how we might improve library services. You have been randomly selected from a list of MSU students to give us your opinions. All of your answers will remain confidential and we are not writing down the names of anyone we interview. Although your participation is voluntary, we need your views to help us improve our services. This survey should only take about 10 minutes of your time. So, if you have a few minutes, I'd like to begin. OK? (IF NOT, ASK THEM IF THERE IS A BETTER TIME TO CALL)

(IF R SAYS HE/SHE NEVER USES THE MSU LIBRARIES TELL THEM THAT IS NOT UNCOMMON AND WE ARE INTERESTED IN ALL MSU STUDENTS OPINIONS, NOT JUST LIBRARY USERS.)

1. In a typical term, about how often do you phone any of the campus libraries?

   2 more than once week  4 once a week  8 every few weeks

   36 couple of times a term  50 never

2. How helpful has the library staff been with your phone questions?

   8 extremely helpful  28 very helpful  14 somewhat helpful

   3 of little help  48 no help at all

3. During a typical term, how often do you go to any of the MSU campus libraries?

   37 more than once a week  23 once a week  19 every few weeks

18 couple of times a term 3 never

4. When you go to a campus library, how often do you ask someone that works there for help?

8 Every time 10 Most of the time 35 Sometimes

34 Rarely 13 Never

5. And when you do ask for help in the Main Library, do you ask at the Reference Desk? (IF YES, THEN ASK:) How helpful was the staff there? Would you say they were extremely helpful, very helpful, somewhat helpful, little help, or no help at all? (IF NO, THEN ASK:) How about the Information Desk? (IF YES, READ THE HELPFUL SCALE, AND IF NO GO TO THE NEXT ITEM. CONTINUE IN THIS WAY UNTIL THE ENTIRE LIST HAS BEEN READ AND CHECKED.)

| No | Yes | | Extreme | Very | Somewhat | Little | None |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 | | Reference Desk | 19 | 60 | 18 | 2 | 1 |
| 41 | | Information Desk | 20 | 61 | 16 | 2 | 1 |
| 74 | | Checkout Desk | 0 | 50 | 33 | 10 | 2 |
| 57 | | Assigned Reading | 13 | 59 | 24 | 4 | 0 |
| 75 | | Circulation | 12 | 57 | 24 | 4 | 2 |
| 80 | | Other | 21 | 66 | 8 | 4 | 1 |

6. Are there other campus libraries other than the Main Library, where you have asked for help?

54 No 46 Yes (IF YES:)

Where? _____. (AND ASK:) How helpful have the staff been there?

16 Extremely helpful 60 Very Helpful 23 Somewhat helpful

0 Of little help 2 No help at all

7. When you do use any of the campus libraries, what do you use them for? For instance do you use them for:

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| Studying | 25 | 75 |
| Use library materials in the library | 13 | 87 |
| Checking out library materials | 33 | 67 |
| Reading current magazines | 67 | 33 |
| Typewriters | 83 | 17 |
| Photocopying | 21 | 80 |
| Assigned reading materials | 34 | 66 |
| Having a computer search done | 70 | 30 |
| Get help finding information | 30 | 70 |
| Using audio or video materials | 58 | 42 |
| Get instruction in library use | 61 | 39 |

8. Now I'm going to read a list of resources people might expect a library to have. For each, please tell me whether or not any of the campus libraries have it. For example, United Nations documents. Do you know if any of the campus libraries have them, don't have them, or aren't you sure?

| | Have | Don't have | Not Sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| United Nations documents | 28 | 1 | 71 |
| Audio tapes | 85 | 1 | 14 |
| Books to tell you how to apply for financial aid | 62 | 2 | 35 |
| Telephone books from other places | 74 | 3 | 23 |
| Movies | 37 | 11 | 52 |
| Best selling novels | 70 | 6 | 24 |
| College and university | 72 | 3 | 25 |

catalogs from other places

9. OK, now I'm going to read a list of services that one might expect to be offered by a library. For each, please tell me whether or not you think the service is offered at any of the campus libraries. For example, editorial assistance in writing a grant proposal. Do any of the campus libraries offer that service, not offer it or aren't you sure?

| | Offer | Not offer | Not sure |
|---|---|---|---|
| Editorial assistance in writing grant proposal | 13 | 6 | 82 |
| Computer printouts of article on a topic | 45 | 6 | 48 |
| Resume prepared for you | 15 | 22 | 63 |
| Article translated into English | 30 | 9 | 62 |
| Someone teach you how to find information | 91 | 2 | 7 |
| Tapes of recordings made for you | 43 | 9 | 8 |
| Current issue of Time to take home | 40 | 29 | 31 |
| Which libraries own a book or magazine | 81 | 3 | 16 |

10. Irrespective of how much you personally use any of the campus libraries, how important are libraries in general to students and faculty in your major field?

47 Extremely important 39 Very important 11 Somewhat

2 Slightly important 0 Not important

11. Did any of your instuctors expect you to go to the library to complete their assignments last term? (IF NO, SKIP TO #13).

34 No 66 Yes

(IF YES:) For each type of assignment I read, please tell me if you had that type last term. For example, were you expected to use assigned reading?

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| Use assigned Reading | 53 | 47 |
| Write term papers | 63 | 37 |
| Write book reviews/reports | 80 | 20 |
| Find and read magazine or journal articles | 60 | 40 |
| Prepare an oral report | 80 | 20 |
| Write a short paper | 58 | 42 |
| Listen to or review tapes | 86 | 14 |
| Complete library workbook | 95 | 5 |
| Write a lab report | 88 | 12 |

12. For your assignments did your instructors tell you how to you use the libraries?

82 No (IF NO, GO TO #13) 18 Yes (IF YES:)

How helpful were your instructors directions? Would you say they were:

2 extremely helpful 7 very helpful 7 somewhat helpful

2 slightly helpful 1 no help at all

13. In general, which of the following do you think your instructors expect you to do in their courses? Answer yes or no. Would you say they expect you to:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Learn or memorize facts | 21 No | 79 Yes |
| Interpret facts | 6 No | 94 Yes |
| Criticize written materials | 32 No | 68 Yes |
| Synthesize different facts or points of view | 13 No | 87 Yes |
| Solve problems | 11 No | 89 Yes |

14. What, if anything, discourages you from using any of the campus libraries?

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| Location | 80 | 20 |
| Piped-in music | 88 | 12 |
| Crowdedness | 45 | 55 |
| Concern about security | 90 | 10 |
| Noise | 62 | 38 |
| Library staff | 96 | 4 |
| Not enough library materials | 89 | 11 |
| Complexity | 68 | 32 |
| Too many demands on my time | 64 | 36 |
| Parking | 60 | 40 |
| Irrelevance to coursework | 82 | 18 |
| Missing materials | 72 | 28 |
| Seating | 73 | 27 |
| Library rules and policies | 87 | 14 |

15. I'm going to read some non-library sources where you might get information needed to complete your courses successfully. For each please tell me how important that source is for you. Let's start with books you buy for classes. Would you say they are of very great importance, very important, somewhat important, slightly important, or not important at all?

| | Very great | very | somewhat | slight | none |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Books you buy | 3 | 17 | 46 | 32 | 2 |
| Class lectures | 2 | 12 | 54 | 30 | 2 |
| Class handouts | 4 | 31 | 47 | 16 | 3 |
| Fraternity, sorority or other files | 8 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 78 |
| Friends or other students | 11 | 44 | 29 | 5 | 11 |
| Advisors or counselors | 15 | 32 | 23 | 4 | 25 |
| Other libraries | 5 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 78 |

16. Do you use libraries other than those here at MSU? (IF NO, GO TO #17) (IF YES, ASK:) Please tell me which library you use the most?

55 No 45 Yes

3 State of Michigan Library

4 U of M Libraries

7 Lansing Public Library

11 East Lansing Public Library

2 Lansing Community College Library

19 Other public libraries

5 Other college libraries

17. Which campus libraries do you use the most?

1 Agricultural Economics

1 Animal Industries

14 Business

3 Chemistry

2 Clinical Center

11 Conrad

0 Cyclotron

7 Engineering

1 Geology

0 Gull Lake

86 Main Library

4 Mathematics

2 Music

3 Physics and Astronomy

0 Planning and Design

1 Veterinary Clinic

6 Other

18. What year in school are you?

19 Freshman 20 Sophomore 26 Junior 15 Senior 21 Grad

(IF NOT A GRADUATE STUDENT ASK:) Do you plan to attend graduate school?

56 No 44 Yes

19. Sex 52 Male 48 Female

20. 56 On-campus 44 Off-campus

21. College enrolled in:

8 Agriculture and Natural Resources

6 Arts and Letters

18 Business

10 Communication Arts and Sciences

4 Education

11 Engineering

4 Human Ecology

1 Human Medicine

2 James Madison

13 Natural Science

2 Nursing

2 Osteopathic Medicine

11 Social Science

2 Veterinary Medicine

6 Undergraduate No-preference

## APPENDIX B

### NON-USER FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE

(Numbers given are % of perons responding)

My name is _____ and I'm a (NAME OF POSITION) in the MSU Libraries. We have received a grant to see how we might improve library services. You have been randomly selected from a list of MSU faculty to give us your opinions, and all of your answers will remain confidential. We are not writing down the names of the people we interview. Although participation is voluntary, we need your views to help us improve our services. If you prefer not to answer a question, I'll skip it. This survey should take ten to fifteen minutes, but you may stop earlier if you need to. So, if you have a few minutes, I'd like to begin. OK?

(IF THEY SAY THEY NEVER USE THE MSU LIBRARIES TELL THEM WE ARE INTERESTED IN ALL MSU FACULTY OPINIONS NOT JUST LIBRARY USERS.)

1. What resources do the MSU Libraries not own that you think we should?

   (WRITE COMMENTS ON COMMENTS SHEETS PROVIDED)

2. What services do the MSU Libraries not offer that you think we should?

   (WRITE COMMENTS ON COMMENTS SHEETS PROVIDED)

3. During a typical term, how often do you phone a campus library?

   5 more than once a week  4 once a week  17 every few weeks

   47 couple of times a term  28 never

4. How helpful, on a scale of 1-5, has the library staff been with your phone questions?

| Extremely Helpful | | | | No Help at all |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

70 22 6 2 1

5. During a typical term how often do you go to any campus library?

31 more than once a week 22 once a week 6 every few weeks

19 couple of times a term 5 never

6. When you are in a campus library, how often do you ask for assistance?

12 Every time 12 Most of the time 46 Sometimes 25 Rarely

5 Never

7. When you have been in the Main Library have you asked for assistance at the information desk? (IF YES, THEN ASK:) On a scale of 1-5, how helpful has the staff been? (IF NO, THEN ASK ABOUT THE NEXT LOCATION. CONTINUE UNTIL YOU HAVE READ THROUGH THE LIST).

| | Extremely Helpful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | No Help 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 32 Information Desk | 38 | 23 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| 23 A Referencce Desk | 50 | 23 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| 54 Checkout Desk | 25 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| 58 Assigned Reading | 18 | 13 | 9 | 2 | 0 |
| 58 Circulation | 18 | 19 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| 73 Bibliographers | 17 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 |

Have you asked for assistance in other places in the Main Library?

72 No 28 Yes (IF YES:) Where_____ (WRITE ON COMMENTS SHEET AND ASK:) How helpful has the staff been?

| Extremely Helpful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | No Help 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

8. Have you asked for assistance in other libraries at MSU?

50 No 50 Yes (IF YES:)Where?_____(WRITE ON COMMENTS SHEET AND ASK:) How helpful has the staff been?

| Extremely Helpful 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | No Help 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 31 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 1 |

9. What are the principal uses you make of campus libraries? For instance do you use them to:

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| Check out material | 16 | 84 |
| Scan or read current journals or newspapers | 24 | 76 |
| Read other non-circulating material | 30 | 70 |
| Make photocopies | 27 | 73 |
| Suggest material for purchase | 42 | 58 |
| Have a computer search done | 49 | 51 |
| Put material on Reserve | 40 | 60 |
| Obtain reference assistance | 21 | 79 |
| Request material on interlibrary loan | 39 | 61 |
| Browse | 42 | 58 |
| Work in a carrel | 77 | 23 |
| Arrange library instruction for you students | 79 | 21 |

10. I will now list services you might expect in an academic research library. For each service, please tell me whether you think it is offered at any of the campus libraries. First, do you think any of the campus libraries offer editorial assistance in writing grant proposals, do not offer it, or are you uncertain?

| | Offered | Not Offered | Uncertain |
|---|---|---|---|
| Editorial assistance in writing a grant proposal | 20 | 24 | 55 |
| Access to library holdings via a home or office computer | 36 | 17 | 46 |
| Providing computer printouts of articles on a topic | 72 | 13 | 16 |
| Having an article translated into English | 18 | 31 | 51 |
| Having someone teach your students how to find information | 88 | 4 | 8 |
| Seminars on new library technology | 78 | 5 | 16 |
| Having a book purchased for assigned reading | 82 | 4 | 14 |
| Checking out a current issue of Time magazine | 23 | 50 | 27 |
| Having someone find out which other libraries own a particular book or journal | 95 | 3 | 3 |
| Having library materials delivered to your office | 47 | 26 | 27 |

11. Regardless of how much you personally use the MSU Libraries, how important, on a scale of 1-5, are libraries as information sources for students and faculty in your field?

| Extremely important | | | | Not important at all |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 88 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 0 |

12. During this current academic year, approximately what percentage of your time was spent in teaching, research, service or outside consulting, or administration?

| | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teaching | 31 | 27 | 27 | 12 | 3 |
| Research | 38 | 31 | 20 | 8 | 4 |
| Service or Consulting | 81 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Administration | 86 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 0 |

13. Do you expect your students to use the MSU libraries to complete your courses successfully? (IF NO, SKIP TO #16)

| No | Yes |
|---|---|
| 25 | 75 |

14. Are your students expected to:

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| Use Assigned Reading | 36 | 64 |
| Find and read journal or magazine articles | 28 | 72 |
| Listen to or view tapes or slides | 80 | 20 |
| Use books or reference materials | 23 | 77 |

15. Do you tell your students how to use libraries?

| No | Yes |
|---|---|
| 74 | 26 |

16. Do you expect your students to do any of the following types of assignments?

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| Prepare oral reports or short papers | 21 | 79 |
| Write term papers or research papers | 26 | 74 |
| Write book reviews or book reports | 70 | 30 |
| Write lab reports | 68 | 32 |

17. Where do yopu expect students to get the information they need to complete these assignemnts? (WRITE COMMENTS ON COMMENT SHEET)

41 Library 16 Textbooks 9 Journals 3 Lab

7 Handouts 5 Lecture 2 Notes 5 Other

3 Professor's material 9 Assigned Reading

18. Have you ever asked the library staff to provide instruction in using the Libraries for your students? (IF YES, ASK:) How successful was it on a scale of 1-5?

| No | Yes |
|---|---|
| 76 | 24 |

| Extremely successful | | | | Not successful |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 50 | 28 | 14 | 2 | 8 |

19. What if anything, discourages you from using any of the campus libraries?

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| Location | 74 | 26 |
| Crowdedness | 84 | 16 |
| Concern about security | 95 | 5 |
| Noise | 87 | 13 |
| Library staff | 96 | 4 |
| Not enough materials | 62 | 38 |
| Complexity | 76 | 24 |
| Too many demands on your time | 35 | 65 |
| Parking | 59 | 41 |
| Missing materials | 60 | 40 |
| Lack of carrels | 91 | 9 |
| Library rules and policies | 90 | 10 |
| No need | 89 | 11 |
| Other (SPECIFY ON COMMENT SHEET) | 82 | 18 |

20. There are four more questions. I will now read some non-library information sources which you might utilize for your research or your classes. Please tell me how important each source is to you on a scale of 1-5.

| | Extremely important 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Not important 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Books you buy | 59 | 23 | 11 | 4 | 4 |
| Your own or department's collection or files | 45 | 22 | 12 | 8 | 13 |
| Personal journals subscriptions | 52 | 19 | 17 | 5 | 8 |
| Professional meetings and conferences | 35 | 28 | 26 | 7 | 4 |

Bookstore browsing 12 20 24 23 21

21. Do you use libraries other than those at MSU? (IF YES, ASK:) Please tell me which you use the most? (IF NO, SKIP TO #23)

| | No | Yes |
|---|---|---|
| State of Michigan Library | 80 | 20 |
| U of M Libraries | 76 | 24 |
| Lansing Public | 89 | 11 |
| East Lansing Public | 63 | 37 |
| LCC | 97 | 3 |
| Other Public Libraries | 86 | 14 |
| Other College Libraries | 90 | 10 |

22. What are the principal reasons you use other libraries?

49 Collection/Resources

4 Services

19 Location/proximity

4 Research environment

0 Library staff

12 Other (SPECIFY ON COMMENT SHEET)

23. Which campus libraries do you use?

4 Animal Industries

22 Business

11 Chemistry

12 Clinical Center

2 Conrad

0 Cyclotron

14 Engineering

2 Geology

1 Gull Lake

84 Main

13 Mathematics

5 Music

7 Physics and Astronomy

0 Planning and Design

8 Veterinary Clinic

20 Other (SPECIFY ON COMMENT SHEET)

24. Have you ever taught at any other college or university? (IF YES, ASK:) Is the MSU Library collection better the same or worse?
Are our facilities better, the same or worse?
Are our services better, the same or worse?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Collection | 1 Better | 34 Same | 11 Worse |
| Facilities | 53 Better | 28 Same | 20 Worse |
| Services | 51 Better | 28 Same | 21 Worse |

25. 82 Male 18 Female

26. 95 Full-time 5 Part-time

27. 58 Professor 22 Associate Prof. 17 Assistant Prof
4 Instructor

28. Number of years at MSU

15 <2 14 2-5 10 5-8 8 8-11 53 12+

29. College employed in

18 Agriculture and Natural Resources
11 Arts and Letters
6 Business
3 Communication Arts
10 Education
4 Engineering
3 Human Ecology
5 Human Medicine
1 James Madison
19 Natural Science
1 Nursing
3 Osteopathic Medicine
11 Social Science
4 Veterinary Medicine